

# NACBS

North American  
Conference on  
British Studies

---

King Henry II and the Earls: The Pipe Roll Evidence

Author(s): Thomas K. Keefe

Source: *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*, Vol. 13, No. 3 (Autumn, 1981), pp. 191-222

Published by: [The North American Conference on British Studies](http://www.nacbs.org)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4048847>

Accessed: 20/06/2014 03:16

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



*The North American Conference on British Studies* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

## King Henry II and the Earls: The Pipe Roll Evidence\*

Thomas K. Keefe

English historians, conditioned by the real or imagined excesses of later Angevin monarchs, are prone to portray Henry II's administration as burdening the baronage with taxes and extra-legal levies.<sup>1</sup> Even Henry II's normally sympathetic biographer, W.L. Warren, could not escape perceiving "an element of financial extortion" in Henry's dealings with the barons.<sup>2</sup> Warren finds in the pipe rolls a number of assessments to regain the king's good will or to put aside his anger. Included in this list are the fines levied against Hamo of Mascy, Gervase Paynel, Adam of Port (Kingston, co. Hereford), and Gilbert son of Fergus of Galloway. These debtors had much in common. They all played a role in the revolt of Henry's sons in 1173-1174, which led, in part, to their amercement.<sup>3</sup> Adam of Port had been exiled for treason prior to his participation in the revolt,<sup>4</sup> while Gilbert son of Fergus, a descendent of one of Henry I's many bastards, had caused the grotesque mutilation and death of his brother which appalled his royal cousin.<sup>5</sup> All in

\*I am grateful to The University Research Committee of Appalachian State University for its support and to Professor C. Warren Hollister for his kind encouragement and helpful suggestions.

<sup>1</sup>Professor J.C. Holt, breaking with tradition, has argued recently that the early Angevin monarchy was not quite so efficient as previously thought in tapping England's financial resources: "The End of the Anglo-Norman Realm," *Proceedings of The British Academy* 61 (1976):19. Judging from the large increase in monies coming to the crown after 1204, Professor Holt's observation has much to recommend it. If so, John's tax measures were a drastic departure from his predecessors, brought about by the need to reconquer his lost continental territories.

<sup>2</sup>*Henry II* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1973), p. 387

<sup>3</sup>*Pipe Roll 23 Henry II* (Pipe Roll Society, 26, 1905), p. 59; *Pipe Roll 21 Henry II* (Pipe Roll Society, 22, 1897), p. 69; *Pipe Roll 28 Henry II* (Pipe Roll Society, 31, 1910), p. 142; *Pipe Roll 25 Henry II* (Pipe Roll Society, 28, 1907), p. 31. See also, *Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi*, ed. William Stubbs, 2 vols. (Rolls Series, 1867) 1: 47; *Chronicles and Memorials of the Reigns of Stephen, Henry II, and Richard I*, ed. Richard Howlett, 4 vols. (Rolls Series, 1884-1889), 3:316, 356, 376, and *passim*; *Pipe Roll 21 Henry II*, pp. 8-9; and *Curia Regis Rolls*, 15 vols. (Public Record Office, 1922-1972) 8:330-331.

<sup>4</sup>*Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi*, 1:41.

<sup>5</sup>*Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi*, 1:67-68, 79-80, 99, 126. The author of the *Gesta* speaks of Gilbert and his brother as "consanguineus Henrici regis Angliae, filii Mathildis imperatricis." Their relationship is explored further in G.W.S. Barrow's *Robert Bruce* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1965), p. 36n. 2, and in C. Warren Hollister and Thomas K. Keefe, "The Making of the Angevin Empire," *The Journal of British Studies* 12 (1973):5, n.17.

all, these men were fortunate to have been left with their lives and most of their lands intact. It simply will not do to fix blindly upon unexplained fines from the record evidence to show the extortionist tendencies of the Angevin monarchs.<sup>6</sup>

The question remains, did Henry II oppress the English baronage with unfair and ruinous exactions? A careful reading of the pipe roll evidence suggests very strongly that he did not, and that the unsuccessful revolt of 1173 ought not to be compared with the more eventful baronial actions of 1212 and 1215. Few monarchs have prospered by taxing the ruling elite beyond its means; Henry II had no inclination to follow so hazardous a course. The true nature of the first Angevin monarch's financial dealings with the baronage is best illustrated by his relationship with the earls—the wealthiest and most powerful of the feudal magnates.

When Henry II became king in late 1154, he inherited an exchequer devastated by nineteen years of civil war. Royal lands and revenues were in the hands of local lords. A wealth of administrative expertise likewise had vanished. It would not be surprising to learn that even the sheriffs had stopped reporting to the exchequer. If so, the annual production of the pipe rolls delineating county payments and receipts would have ceased altogether. Interestingly enough, no pipe roll survives from Stephen's reign and those coming from the first years of Henry II's reign are greatly reduced in size and scope compared to those from later years. And if the limited exchequer productivity in 1173 and 1215 is any indication of what nineteen years of civil war might do,<sup>7</sup> then one of Henry's major tasks in rebuilding a strong English monarchy was the restoration of the exchequer.

But such a restoration program would place Henry on a collision course with the earls, "among whom," as one contemporary put it, "Stephen had distributed imprudently nearly all the revenues of the exchequer."<sup>8</sup> Henry himself and his mother, Empress Matilda, surely shared some responsibility in this, not to mention the earls' own capacity for self-initiative. Most earldoms existing in 1155 had been created by one side or another during the past civil war. Only seven of some twenty-three earldoms can be shown to have been in existence in 1135 at the time of King Henry I's death and Stephen's usurpation.<sup>9</sup> Because of the political necessity of baronial sup-

<sup>6</sup>See C. Warren Hollister's comments on the similar misinterpretation of the sole surviving pipe roll of Henry I's reign: "Henry I and the Anglo-Norman Magnates," *Proceedings of the Battle Abbey Conference 1979* (Ipswich, 1980), pp. 94, 103.

<sup>7</sup>Compare *Pipe Roll 19 Henry II* (Pipe Roll Society, 19, 1895) and *Pipe Roll 17 John* (Pipe Roll Society, NS, 37, 1965) with other rolls from the two reigns.

<sup>8</sup>Robert of Torigny, *Chronicles and Memorials*, 4:183-185.

<sup>9</sup>The earldoms as they appear in alphabetical order are: Buckingham\*, Chester\*, Cornwall, Derby, Devon, Essex, Gloucester\*, Hereford†, Hertford, Huntingdon\*, Leicester\*, Lincoln†,

port, these new earldoms were granted to men already tremendously wealthy and with considerable local influence. In 1166 when Henry surveyed his kingdom's feudal resources, the nineteen surviving earldoms contained over thirty-four percent of all knights' fees, although the earldoms themselves represented just six percent of the baronies.<sup>10</sup> Thus, feudal power was concentrated within this small group of barons—the elite within a society of elites. In restoring the exchequer, and the monarchy, Henry would have to ask for the return of former royal lands and revenues. He also would have to accomplish this without offending the earls. That Henry was able to pursue a successful restoration policy with the actual cooperation of the earls is the secret of his reign; but it is a secret revealed by the pipe roll evidence.

Table 1 sets out the exchequer record for the period 1155-1189 for some thirty-four earls. The columns list the earl and his earldom, the number of his knights' fees, the beginning and ending dates of his exchequer accounting period, the total years in the account-period, the total of assessments levied, paid, or pardoned, and the percentage of actual payment toward the amount levied. This last statistic brings us much closer to the reality of the king's and earls' financial relationship: low rates of payment and frequent pardons. Thus, William of Gloucester, assessed at £557 over a twenty-eight year period, paid only fifty-three percent of his assessment, some £294, and so on. The monies paid in Earl William's case work out to an annual payment into the exchequer of about 8d. on the knight's fee (8d. = £ 294 ÷ 322 kf ÷ 28 yrs). On the average, earls paid less than 1s. per year per knight's fee into Henry II's exchequer, while their rate of payment toward the levies was forty-four percent. A sampling of twenty-six other barons shows a 6s. annual return on the knight's fee.<sup>11</sup> Clearly,

---

Norfolk, Northampton, Oxford, Pembroke, Richmond, Salisbury, Surrey\*, Sussex, Warwick\*, Worcester†, and York†. The original seven are marked by an asterisk; the four allowed to lapse by Henry II are marked by a cross. A good short introduction to the creation of earldoms under King Stephen and Empress Matilda can be found in R.H.C. Davis, *King Stephen*, 2nd ed. (New York, 1977), Appendix I:129-145.

<sup>10</sup>The information on knights' fees and baronial enfeoffments in this paper has been drawn from my *Feudal Assessments and the Political Community Under Henry II and His Sons*, University of California Press, forthcoming. The fee totals refer to both English and Welsh enfeoffments in cases where such information is available.

<sup>11</sup>Included in this sample are barons who fought for and against Henry II in the 1173 Rebellion, those otherwise active or inactive in royal service, as well as those with great and lowly estates. They are: Baldwin Wake, Hugh Wake, Gervase Paynel, Henry II of Pomeray, Hugh of Bayeux, Henry of Lacy, Bernard II of Balliol, William II of Mauduit, Walter of Wahulle, Simon of Wahulle, Walter of Aincourt, John of Aincourt, Hugh of Dover, John of Dover, Walter Fitz Robert of Clare, William count of Aumale, John count of Eu, Henry count of Eu, Roger of Mowbray, William Archard, Maurice of Craon, Roger Merlay, William Merlay, Hugh of Lacy, Gilbert of Mountfichet, and William of Ros.

England's wealthiest tenants-in-chief, the earls, were favored at the exchequer. But who were the earls?

D.C. Douglas and John Le Patrouel, two scholars who have worked extensively with William the Conqueror's baronage, agree that the founder of the Anglo-Norman state achieved unquestioned authority over his realm through the promotion of a new aristocracy dominated by a few great families related to one another, and more importantly, to the royal house.<sup>12</sup> Although the time had passed by Henry II's reign when a monarch might raise up a new aristocracy from the dust, dynasticism in royal governance and control remained as strong as ever. Herein lies the key to royal-baronial relations and the understanding of the pipe roll evidence.

The two most powerful magnates in England in the 1150s and 1160s, according to William of Canterbury, were Robert II of Beaumont earl of Leicester and Reginald of Dunstanville earl of Cornwall.<sup>13</sup> The choice is most perceptive. Robert II possessed the large Norman fiefs of Breteuil and Pacy along with the English earldom of Leicester. His eldest son controlled the Norman honor of Grandmesnil in right of his wife. Waleran count of Meulan was the earl's twin brother; their half-brother Reginald of Warenne had become lord of Wormengay in England. Other immediate relations were the earl's sons-in-law William earl of Gloucester, Geoffrey of Mayenne, and Gervase Paynel of Dudley; his grandsons Simon III of St. Liz earl of Northampton and Roger IV of Tosny; his granddaughters Isabel wife of William III of Mauduit, Mabel countess of Evreux, and Amice countess of Hertford; his nephews Richard Fitz Gilbert of Clare earl of Pembroke and Robert II of Cauc; his niece Isabel of Warenne countess of Surrey; and his cousins Rotrou archbishop of Rouen, Henry lord of Neuburg, William earl of Warwick, and Gundreda countess of Norfolk.<sup>14</sup> Earl Robert's impressive connections, no doubt, were one of the reasons that Henry II called on him to assume the post of chief justiciar in England

<sup>12</sup>Douglas, *William The Conqueror* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1964) pp. 83-104, 136-137, 269-271; Le Patourel, *The Norman Empire* (Oxford, 1976), pp. 286-288, and idem, "Normandy and England, 1066-1144" (The Stenton Lecture 1970; Reading, 1971). C. Warren Hollister, "Magnates and *Curiales* in Early Norman England," *Viator* 8 (1977):63-81 gives a detailed picture of the great post-Conquest barons and their relations with the crown. On the newness of the Norman aristocracy see also Lucien Musset, "L'aristocratie normande au xie siècle," in *La noblesse au moyen âge, xi-e-xv-e siècles. Essais à la mémoire de Robert Boutruche*, ed. Phillipe Contamine (Paris, 1976), pp. 88-94.

<sup>13</sup>*Materials for the History of Thomas Becket*, eds. James C. Robertson and J.B. Sheppard, 7 vols. (Rolls Series, 1875-1885) 1:16.

<sup>14</sup>The details of the Beaumont-le-Roger genealogy are given in *Complete Peerage*, eds., George Edward Cokayne, Vicary Gibbs, *et al*, rev ed., 12 vols. (London, 1910-1959) 6:643; 7: 527-533; 9:583-586, 664; 10:348; 12, pt. i:757-764; 12, pt. ii:361.

in 1155, a post from which the earl would oversee the workings of the English courts and exchequer. In making this choice Henry involved the earls directly in the governance of the kingdom.

Although Reginald of Dunstanville earl of Cornwall held no official post with the new administration, his influence was no less than the earl of Leicester's. As for lands and wealth, the earldom of Cornwall ranks among the top five baronies in England (see Table 1). Reginald also controlled the earldom of Devon from 1162 to 1175 as guardian of his grandson Baldwin II of Redvers, making him the dominant power in southwestern England. Among the earl's numerous nephews were William earl of Gloucester, Roger bishop of Worcester, Henry II of Pomeray, William II of Tracy, Conan duke of Brittany and earl of Richmond, and Hugh earl of Chester. Robert Fitz Edith lord of Okehampton was the earl's half-brother. But far more important, Earl Reginald, a bastard of King Henry I, was Henry II's maternal uncle and the senior ranking male member of the royal house.<sup>15</sup>

The Beaumonts and the Angevins naturally gravitated toward one another as the two most powerful families in the Anglo-Norman state. Thus, the earl of Gloucester married a daughter of the earl of Leicester, while a daughter of the earl of Cornwall married the heir of the count of Meulan. Isabel of Warenne brought the rich earldom of Surrey to her second husband, Hameline of Anjou, Henry's own half-brother. As the 1160s closed, Beaumonts and Angevins were situated in ten of England's nineteen earldoms (Gloucester, Devon, Richmond, Surrey, Cornwall, Chester, Leicester, Pembroke, Northampton, and Warwick), while enjoying an equally large assortment of bishoprics, counties, and baronies on both sides of the Channel. Robert II earl of Leicester reigned as justiciar of England, employing among others at the exchequer his brother Reginald of Warenne and son-in-law William III of Mauduit the chamberlain.<sup>16</sup> Reginald of Dunstanville, on the other hand, kept constant company with his royal nephew, giving advice and performing administrative and military functions. For this he was rewarded with virtual independence of his county from royal administration, including accounting to the exchequer.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>15</sup>On the Angevin family network, see *Complete Peerage* (rev ed.) 3:428-429; 4:313; 5:689; 7:496; 12, pt. i:496; and 11:105-121.

<sup>16</sup>A convenient summary of Reginald of Warenne's exchequer activity is found in Thomas Madox, *The History and Antiquities of the Exchequer*, 2nd ed. 2 vols. (London 1769, reprint ed 1969) 1:123, 143-146. The Mauduit chamberlainship of the exchequer is surveyed by Emma Mason, *The Beauchamp Cartulary Charters 1100-1268* (Pipe Roll Society, NS, 43, 1980), pp. lii-liv and 102-105.

<sup>17</sup>Allowing Reginald to hold the county of Cornwall free of royal administration was a singular departure from Henry II's restoration policy, perhaps understandable in light of the close relationship between the two men. Cornwall does not begin to account to the exchequer until the

Henry II looked beyond his kinsmen and the Beaumonts, of course, for the governance and defense of England. It is well-known that men of lesser rank were recruited for his administration,<sup>18</sup> but attention should be given to his reliance on men drawn from the ranks of the earls. They held key government posts, traveled great distances on the king's business, acted as justices, attended the great councils, witnessed important documents, supervised the maintenance of castles, and when the need arose led the king's armies. Thus, Roger of Clare earl of Hertford supervised part of the commission charged in 1170 with investigating the conduct of sheriffs during the king's recent absence from England.<sup>19</sup> Earlier in 1166, Geoffrey of Mandeville earl of Essex was one of two judges sent throughout England under the first general eyre of the reign.<sup>20</sup> Both the eyre and the promising career of Earl Geoffrey were cut short by the earl's untimely death while leading a royal army into North Wales on a disciplinary raid.<sup>21</sup> Patrick earl of Salisbury was similarly killed while in royal service. In 1163, Patrick took over the twin offices of military commander and governor of Poitou only to be murdered in 1168 at the hands of a Poitevien noble.<sup>22</sup> Another of the earls, William II of Aubigny earl of Sussex, followed a more varied career than the rest. Between 1167 and 1170 he acted as defender of the Welsh frontier, taking time out to assist Henry on the continent in one of the many wars with Louis VII of France, and to accompany Princess Matilda to Germany before her wedding to the Duke of Saxony. Prior to all this, Earl William had traveled to Rome with a special embassy sent to discuss the

---

earl's death in 1175. Reginald's close relationship with his nephew is suggested further by his many attestations of royal charters and writs. The most comprehensive collections of Henry II's diploma are Robert W. Eyton, *Court, Household, and Itinerary of Henry II* (London, 1878) and *Recueil des actes de Henri II*, eds. Léopold Delisle and Élie Berger, 3 vols. (Paris, 1909-1927). The earl would place among the king's top ten attestors on the basis of these collections. A more precise ranking will be possible after the publication of Professor J.C. Holt's definitive edition of early Angevin charters now in progress.

<sup>18</sup>A good recent discussion of Henry II's recruitment of administrators is J.E. Lalley, "Secular Patronage at the Court of King Henry II," *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 49 (1976): 160-184.

<sup>19</sup>*The Historical Works of Gervase of Canterbury*, ed. William Stubbs, 2 vols. (Rolls Series, 1879-1880) 1:217.

<sup>20</sup>*Pipe Roll 12 Henry II* (Pipe Roll Society, 9, 1888), pp. 7, 14, 30. Richard of Lucy was the second of the two itinerant justices.

<sup>21</sup>*The Foundation Book of Walden Abbey* printed in *Monasticon Anglicanum*, new edition, eds. John Caley *et al*, 6 vols. (London, 1846) 4:142-143.

<sup>22</sup>Robert of Torigny, *Chronicles and Memorials*, 4: 235-236; Ralph of Diceto, *Imagines Historiarum*, ed., William Stubbs, 2 vols. (Rolls Series, 1876) 1:331; *Gesta Henrici Secundi*, 1:343; Walter Map, *De Nugis Curialium*, ed. M.R. James (Oxford, 1914), p. 305; *Recueil des actes de Henri II*, Intro:411. The Norman magnate William chamberlain of Tancarville succeeded Earl Patrick as governor of Poitou.

king's side of the sensitive Becket affair.<sup>23</sup>

What follows from this brief discussion is that the interests of the earls and the monarchy cannot be separated too finely, for the two were bound closely by ties of kinship, friendship, and policy. It is highly unlikely that the agents and shapers of royal policy, including Henry himself, would press too hard financially upon family, friends, and peers. The pipe rolls show this to be the case.

Very few taxes could be levied against the baronage in common in the twelfth century. The most predominant tax in this category was scutage, an assessment on the knight's fee, or fief, in place of service in the feudal host. "It sometimes happens," observed Henry II's treasurer Richard Fitz Nigel, "that when enemies threaten or attack the kingdom, the king decrees that a payment shall be made, say a mark or a pound from every knight's fee, to provide gifts and monies for soldiers . . . This sum, paid as it is according to the number of shields (*scuta*), is called scutage."<sup>24</sup> Accordingly, numerous references to scutage are found throughout the pipe rolls. A similar tax, known as an aid, could be taken for the ransoming of the king if he were captured, again for the marriage of his eldest daughter, or the knighting of his eldest son. The negotiations for the marriage of Princess Matilda to the Duke of Saxony set in motion the great feudal survey of 1166. Henry was expecting an expensive wedding and his methodical mind made him concerned that the barons contribute their fair share to the costs—thus the survey of knights' fees. An aid based on the details of the survey did come in 1168, and later, in 1172, the same information was used to assess a scutage for the army of Ireland. A second aid, this one for the knighting of the king's son, was pre-empted by the young prince's being knighted by one of his entourage during his rebellious defiance of his father in 1173.<sup>25</sup> Historians, reasoning from this evidence, have seen the above assessments and the survey of knights' fees itself as major contributing factors to the 1173 rebellion. In other words, the 1166 survey, 1168 aid, and 1172 scutage are perceived by some as an underlying cause of the rebellion and proof of Henry II's administrative high-handedness.<sup>26</sup> But on closer inspection these measures had little or nothing at all to do with the rebellion.

<sup>23</sup>*Dictionary of National Biography*, 1:233-234; *The Red Book of the Exchequer*, ed. Hubert Hall, 3 vols. (Rolls Series, 1896) 2:cclxvii-cclxxiii; *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket*, 3:72-73; and *Radulphi Nigri Chronica*, ed. Robert Anstruther (Caxton Society, 13, 1851), p. 170.

<sup>24</sup>*Dialogus de Scaccario*, ed. Charles Johnson (London, 1950), p. 52.

<sup>25</sup>*Histoire de Guillaume le Maréchal*, ed. Paul Meyer, 3 vols. (Paris, 1891-1901) 2:76-79.

<sup>26</sup>See, Thomas M. Jones, *War of the Generations, The Revolt of 1173-1174* (Medieval Text Association, 1980), pp. 43-46; W.L. Warren, *Henry II*, p. 124; D.E. Greenway, ed., *Charters of the Honour of Mowbray, 1107-1191* (The British Academy, 1972), p. xxix; and John E. Morris, "The Assessment of Knight Service in Bedfordshire," *Bedfordshire Historical Record Society* 5 (1926):7.

Scutage ran occasionally in Henry's reign. There were only eight scutages levied between 1155 and 1189, for the years 1156, 1159, 1161, 1162, 1165, 1168, 1172, 1187.<sup>27</sup> On each of these occasions, a sizable number of barons remained unassessed either because they had served in the host, acted in some other royal capacity, or were passed over by the exchequer. Of those who were assessed, many later received complete or partial pardon of the sums charged against them. Pardons also were granted from the 1168 aid. As it happened, some barons who came under assessment for the first and last time in 1168 had the full amount of their assessment remitted and consequently never paid a single penny towards any of the royal taxes levied against knights' fees. This was the case with Walter Fitz Robert of Clare,<sup>28</sup> Hugh of Lacy,<sup>29</sup> and William II of Aubigny earl of Sussex,<sup>30</sup> to name but a few. It is hazardous, therefore, to generalize solely on the basis of the survey and assessments that the baronage in general, and the earls in particular, were aroused to rebellion. It equally would be a mistake to read into Henry's fiscal and administrative policies some sinister desire to sap baronial power and resources. Sidney Painter writes,

As long as the crown sought actual knights from the barons, it mattered little how many knights the barons had enfeoffed. The traditional quotas supplied more knights than the king could use. It must have annoyed Henry to be able to collect scutage on only sixty knights from the Mandeville barony when he felt certain that the Mandevilles had granted many more knights' fees.<sup>31</sup>

Surely not. The Mandevilles were close supporters of the king and his administration. Earl Geoffrey died leading the king's army, and his brother, as we shall see, became the king's best friend. It is therefore incorrect to suggest that Henry hungered after revenues from the Mandeville knights' fees. Quite the opposite is true. Their earldom of Essex with its 110 knights' fees paid no more than £23 in scutages to the exchequer throughout the entire reign,<sup>32</sup> or less than 2d. per year per knight's fee. Similar figures can be cited for other earldoms.

The scutage figures for earldoms and earls are shown in Table 2. The table lists the number of assessments, the amount of scutage assessed, and the payment per year per knight's fee: scutage ÷ accounting period ÷ knights' fees. The average payment by the earls toward scutage is 5d. per

<sup>27</sup>Four levies were made in nine years under Richard I. John, in comparison, assessed eleven scutages in his sixteen year reign.

<sup>28</sup>*Pipe Roll 14 Henry II* (Pipe Roll Society, 12, 1890), p. 39; *Pipe Roll 15 Henry II* (Pipe Roll Society, 13, 1890), p. 125; *Pipe Roll 22 Henry II* (Pipe Roll Society, 25, 1904), p. 3.

<sup>29</sup>*Pipe Roll 14 Henry II*, p. 116; *Pipe Roll 15 Henry II*, p. 58.

<sup>30</sup>*Pipe Roll 14 Henry II*, pp. 21, 194; *Pipe Roll 17 Henry II* (Pipe Roll Society, 16, 1893), p. 6; *Pipe Roll 21 Henry II*, p. 82.

<sup>31</sup>Sidney Painter, *Studies in the History of the English Feudal Barony* (Baltimore, 1943), p. 34.

<sup>32</sup>*Pipe Roll 8 Henry II* (Pipe Roll Society, 5, 1885), p. 71; *Pipe Roll 14 Henry II*, p. 39.

year per fee, a sum insufficient to support even the 8d. to 12d. cost of a fully equipped knight for a single day. The averages for individual earls, although still quite low, vary significantly. These variations cannot be explained by Beaumont-Angevin family connections, simply because so many of the earls were related to one or both families. Far more important factors are the year an earl began his tenure, whether he inherited his earldom after a minority, and his activity, or lack of it, in the king's service. For example, Richard III earl of Hertford, William III of Aubigny earl of Sussex, Roger Bigod earl of Norfolk, and Waleran earl of Warwick all came into possession of their estates in or after 1173 when seven of Henry's eight scutages had already been taken. As none of these earls fell under assessment in 1187, their payment rate was zero.

The second group in the table is made up of earls who spent part of their tenure as minor wards, either of the crown or a baronial guardian. The range of payments, 10d. to 19d., is the highest of all the groups. This is easily explained by the fact that full knightly contingents rarely were called up from baronies under wardship, and that scutage in this instance was collectable from every knight's fee irrespective of traditional quotas. Moreover, there was less of a chance for a pardon when a minor ward was involved. The two exceptions in this group—William of Blois and Hugh of Chester, are special cases. William of Blois, King Stephen's only surviving son, scarcely obtained his majority before he died during the 1159 Toulouse campaign;<sup>33</sup> he was never assessed scutage. Hugh of Chester, on the other hand, spent thirteen long years as a minor, reaching his majority in 1168. It appears as though the earldom of Chester had an exemption from paying royal scutages, for none were assessed in this period. The £13 scutage shown in Table 2 actually comes from a Chester subtenancy in the Roumare barony. No return for the earldom was sent into the 1166 survey, nor were the 1168 aid and 1172 scutage assessed. It is not until the minority of

<sup>33</sup>Robert of Torigny, *Chronicles and Memorials*, 4:196, 206. It seems reasonable that Henry II would have put off William of Blois' knighting as long as possible, since William, as Stephen's only surviving son, was a potential claimant to the throne. The 1158 knighting, then, must have followed shortly after William's twenty-first birthday. The question is whether he was in full control of his estates before this date. In 1157, all estates not part of Stephen's original patrimony were taken from William and returned to royal hands: *idem*, p. 193. Was the patrimony in the king's custody as well? Unfortunately, the pipe rolls do not help us here: see, *The Great Roll of the Pipe for the Second, Third, and Fourth Years of the Reign of King Henry II*, ed. Joseph Hunter (Record Commission, 1844), pp. 7, 9, 11, 13, 31, 61, 94-97, 128-129, and *passim*; and *Pipe Roll 5 Henry II* (Pipe Roll Society, 1, 1884), pp. 5, 11, and *passim*.

Rannulph III of Chester in 1187 that the earldom is brought to account for its knights' fees before the exchequer.<sup>34</sup>

The payment rate of the next group of earls, those active in the king's service, is clearly the lowest, 0 to 5d. Here we find Richard of Redvers earl and Sheriff of Devon, Geoffrey of Mandeville earl of Essex the sometime justice, Robert II of Beaumont earl of Leicester the justiciar, Patrick of Salisbury the governor of Poitou, Roger of Clare earl of Hertford a royal commissioner, Reginald of Dunstanville a sometime sheriff, justice, and royal general, William II of Aubigny earl of Sussex defender of the Welsh frontier and royal ambassador, and Richard Fitz Gilbert of Clare earl of Pembroke, Hameline of Anjou earl of Surrey, William of Mandeville earl of Essex all generals in the royal army at one time or another, men whose service and connections naturally exempted them from scutage. Earl Reginald, of course, was charged some £370 worth of scutage under two levies. He never made an effort to pay the debt; the exchequer never tried to collect it.<sup>35</sup>

It would be wrong to draw the conclusion from this evidence that these men's subtenants escaped scutage. Sustaining oneself in royal service was a costly affair, but this is exactly why the great barons had been given their lands and privilege. Service was an obligation of the rich, their reason for being. So, too, with the subtenants: they owed services and monies to their lords, not the least of which was scutage. Fragments from the 1170 Inquest of Sheriffs offer a rare glimpse into this world of subvassal financial obligations.<sup>36</sup> From these fragments we learn that certain of the earl of Sussex's Norfolk tenants contributed over £60 in scutages for four campaigns between 1166 and 1170.<sup>37</sup> A subtenant of the earl of Hertford lost a good horse to distraint for failure to pay a £3 scutage promptly,<sup>38</sup> and

<sup>34</sup>*Pipe Roll 11 Henry II* (Pipe Roll Society, 8, 1887), pp. 37-38; and *Pipe Roll 33 Henry II* (Pipe Roll Society, 37, 1915), p. 28.

<sup>35</sup>*Pipe Roll 14 Henry II*, p. 129; *Pipe Roll 18 Henry II* (Pipe Roll Society, 18, 1894), p. 102; *Pipe Roll 21 Henry II*, pp. 21, 37, 58, 62, 65; and *Pipe Roll 22 Henry II*, pp. 142-143. The debt was collected from the royal custodian assigned to Cornwall after the earl's death.

<sup>36</sup>The known fragments from the 1170 Inquest of Sheriffs can be found in *The Red Book of the Exchequer*, 2:ccxvii-ccxxi, nos. 1-58; James Tait, "A New Fragment of the Inquest of Sheriffs, 1170," *English Historical Review* 29 (1924):80-83; Helen Richardson, "A Twelfth Century Anglo-Norman Charter," *Bulletin of the John Rylands' Library* 24 (1940): 168-172, and "An Anglo-Norman Return to the Inquest of Sheriffs," *Bulletin of the John Rylands' Library* 27 (1942-1943):179-181.

<sup>37</sup>*The Red Book of the Exchequer*, nos 1-6. Charter evidence also places Earl William in the king's company during a campaign into Brittany in July 1166. See, *Recueil des actes de Henri II*, 1:246-247.

<sup>38</sup>*The Red Book of the Exchequer*, 2: no. 47. Robert of Bruecourt, the vassal in question, is shown by the 1166 survey to have held 3 knights' fees of the earldom of Hertford, suggesting a scutage rate here of 20s. on the knight's fee. See, *idem*, 1:404.

so on. It is important to remember, then, that even though the earls might not be paying scutage into the exchequer, subtenants were paying scutage to the earls. Scutage cannot be dismissed as a meaningless tax.

The examination of scutage accounts is particularly useful in identifying those earls who saw limited royal service, or better still, were at odds with the king. In this connection, the final grouping is somewhat eclectic with payment rates running anywhere from 0 to 22d. The earls of Buckingham and Oxford are simply phantoms, little of their activity appears in the record sources.<sup>39</sup> Other members of the group, such as the earl of Gloucester, the earl of Northampton, and the earl of Salisbury did render some support to the king during the 1173 rebellion, yet cannot be said to have been overtly active on many occasions.<sup>40</sup> Others, such as Conan of Brittany earl of Richmond and the earls of Huntingdon were members of foreign ruling houses and spent practically no time in their earldoms. Moreover, their earldoms often were in the king's hand as a result of political differences between England, Scotland, and Brittany.<sup>41</sup> We are left with Robert III of Beaumont, successor to the earldom of Leicester, and Hugh Bigod earl of Norfolk, who at 10d. and 22d. show the highest rate of payment of scutage for earls receiving tenure without first having been a minor. Robert III earl of Leicester and Hugh Bigod earl of Norfolk, too, were the principal leaders among the barons of the 1173 rebellion. Their scutage payments are, however, more a sign of disaffection and later

<sup>39</sup>Earl Walter Giffard seems to have kept himself away from court in Henry I's and Stephen's reigns as well, attesting few, if any, charters. See, C. Warren Hollister, "Henry I and the Anglo-Norman Magnates," *Proceedings of the Battle Abbey Conference 1979*, pp. 98 and 186 n. 21; R.H.C. Davis, *King Stephen*, p. 132; and J.W. Leedom, "The English Settlement of 1153," *History* 65 (1980):362. Earl Aubrey III of Ver, however, was quite active on the Angevin and later the Blois side in the civil war of Stephen's reign, see Leedom, p. 363 and Davis, p. 140. Earl Aubrey's activities under Henry II merit further study, seeing as how he survived the thirty-five year reign with so little notice.

<sup>40</sup>*Gesta Henrici Secundi*, 1:51 n. 4, 61, 71.

<sup>41</sup>Henry II settled the matter of Richmond when he had his son Geoffrey engaged to Conan's daughter and heir, Constance. After the two had married, both the earldom of Richmond and the more important duchy of Brittany became Angevin fiefs. On this, see W.L. Warren, *Henry II*, pp. 563-564. As far as the earldom of Huntingdon is concerned, King Malcom IV of Scotland and his brothers, King William and Prince David, all held the honor at one point in Henry's reign. Following William's and David's participation on the losing side in the 1173 revolt, Huntingdon was assigned to Simon III of St. Liz earl of Northampton, whose family had an hereditary claim to the honor. After Simon died in 1184 without leaving any direct heir, Huntingdon returned to the Scottish House. See, Jordan Fantosme, *Chronicles and Memorials*, 3:232, 284, 296, 298, 372; and I.J. Sanders, *English Baronies, A Study of Their Origin and Descent, 1086-1327* (Oxford, 1963), p. 118. Huntingdon's rather complex history in and out of royal custody is the reason why the earldom's appearance in the tables is as a single entry, not as a fief of the individual earls.

discipline than a cause for rebellion.

An examination of the scutage record of other 1173 rebels goes far to support the above conclusion. About eleven English barons and earls joined Leicester and Norfolk in the revolt. Of these, neither the earl of Huntingdon nor the earl of Chester had been charged for the levies of 1168 or 1172. In five other cases, Walter of Wahulle<sup>42</sup> and Gervase Paynel<sup>43</sup> had not been assessed beyond their traditional quotas; Gilbert of Mountfichet<sup>44</sup> and Simon of Beauchamp<sup>45</sup> had had a substantial portion of their assessments pardoned to them; while the earl of Derby<sup>46</sup> had gained a full pardon from the 1168 aid and had not fallen under reassessment in 1172. One is hard pressed to show any connection between scutage and rebellion in most cases.

In other cases such a connection can only be an assumption, not a proven fact. An example is Robert III of Beaumont earl of Leicester, the son of the king's trusted justiciar, Robert II. The Leicester earldom had never been asked to account for scutage before 1172 when the sum of £142 was demanded on 157 knights' fees.<sup>47</sup> This is not an excessive amount; that it was assessed at all is significant. Obviously, Robert III did not have the influence with the king his father had before him. Perhaps this is why he rebelled, hoping to find such influence at the court of Henry's son, whom he supported for the throne. It was an acceptable gamble for a twelfth century magnate; he lost. A second scutage of £197 later was taken from Leicester in the 1180s when the earldom suffered confiscation during a political crisis.<sup>48</sup> Robert III had yet to gain Henry's trust. Nevertheless, the distinction between the two scutages is important, for the largest assessment and payment came after not before the rebellion.

Hugh Bigod earl of Norfolk is another story entirely. Norfolk, as the pipe roll evidence suggests, was the most heavily assessed of all the barons before 1173, in both scutages and other exactions (see also Table 1). The largest of his assessments came in 1165 with simultaneous demands of £1000 and £227. The first demand has been connected perceptively by R. Allen Brown with Norfolk's repurchase of the castles of Framlingham and Bungay

<sup>42</sup>*The Red Book of the Exchequer*, 1:322-323, and *Pipe Roll 14 Henry II*, p. 10.

<sup>43</sup>*The Red Book of the Exchequer*, 1:269-270, and *Pipe Roll 14 Henry II*, p. 119.

<sup>44</sup>*Pipe Roll 14 Henry II*, p. 38; *Pipe Roll 15 Henry II*, p. 125; *Pipe Roll 16 Henry II* (Pipe Roll Society, 15, 1892), p. 106; *Pipe Roll 22 Henry II*, p. 3.

<sup>45</sup>*Pipe Roll 14 Henry II*, p. 10; *Pipe Roll 18 Henry II*, p. 52; *Pipe Roll 21 Henry II*, p. 51; *Pipe Roll 22 Henry II*, pp. 17-18.

<sup>46</sup>*Pipe Roll 14 Henry II*, p. 99. As was pointed out earlier, most of these assessments came during the earl's minority.

<sup>47</sup>*Pipe Roll 18 Henry II*, p. 109; *Pipe Roll 19 Henry II*, pp. 67, 104.

<sup>48</sup>*Pipe Roll 29 Henry II* (Pipe Roll Society, 32, 1911), pp. 153-154 and *passim*.

confiscated by Henry II in 1157.<sup>49</sup> The second demand arose from the levy for the 1165 army of Wales.<sup>50</sup> Additional demands followed in 1168 for the marriage of Princess Matilda (£108),<sup>51</sup> and in 1176—“de omnibus querelis et demandis preteritis que ad denarios pertinent, et ut teneat terras quas habet de dominio regis in vita sua” (£466).<sup>52</sup> Added together, Norfolk’s assessments reach £1816, of which £1132 were paid. This comes to over 6s. per year per knight’s fee, an amount more characteristic of the average baron than an earl. Here again though, the demands are a symptom of disaffection as opposed to a root cause. We do not know for certain why Henry took away the earl’s two most important castles, or why he demanded such a large sum of money for their return. All that can be said is that there was an obvious friction between king and earl. Certainly, Henry meant to reduce Norfolk’s power; just as certainly Norfolk resented the king’s intent and his means. Henry’s mistake was to alienate the earl; the result was rebellion when the opportunity presented itself. Had Henry turned Norfolk into a *familiaris*, he might never have rebelled, nor would his exchequer record have been so dismal.

Yet the exchequer records of Robert III earl of Leicester and Hugh Bigod earl of Norfolk are atypical of earls in general. Most earls were obligated to the exchequer for little beyond scutage (see Table 3), which meant small payments, if any. In restoring the exchequer to its former level of productivity, Henry managed to leave the large private fortunes of the great barons relatively untouched. He wanted their loyalty and service, not their money.

The favoritism shown the earls at the exchequer is nowhere more striking than in the instance of reliefs, a feudal equivalent of the inheritance tax. “According to the custom of the realm,” writes the justiciar Rannulph of Glanville, “a reasonable relief for a knight’s fee is £5, but for baronies there is no certain figure laid down, for the barons in making satisfaction to the lord king for their reliefs are at his mercy and pleasure.”<sup>53</sup> In the question of reliefs, Henry’s mercy and pleasure have been seen by some historians as “uncertain,” perhaps even extortionate.<sup>54</sup> Quite the reverse is true. Considering the exemptions from taxation enjoyed by the earls, the moment of inheritance could well have been the only time the monarch could exact a

<sup>49</sup>R.Allen Brown, “Framlingham Castle and Bigod, 1154-1216,” *Suffolk Institute of Archaeology and Natural History: Proceedings* 25 (1950):130-132, and *Pipe Roll 11 Henry II*, p. 7.

<sup>50</sup>*Pipe Roll 11 Henry II*, p. 7.

<sup>51</sup>*Pipe Roll 14 Henry II*, p. 22.

<sup>52</sup>*Pipe Roll 22 Henry II*, p. 70; see also, pp. 62, 65-66.

<sup>53</sup>Rannulph of Glanville, *Tractatus de legibus et consuetudinibus regni Anglie qui Glanvill vocatur*, ed. G.D. Hall (NMT, 1965), p. 108.

<sup>54</sup>For example, see W.L. Warren, *Henry II*, p. 386.

hefty sum from an earldom and expect prompt payment. Of course, a relief could be exacted only if the earl came into possession of his earldom without having been a minor. This was a reasonable condition, since the custodian, either a guardian who has paid for the privilege or an appointed royal official, would have taken monies out of the estate already. Altogether, Henry had nine opportunities to exact reliefs from earldoms.<sup>55</sup> The pipe rolls reveal that he did so only once—in 1184, when Waleran of Neuburg inherited the earldom of Warwick from his brother, William. The Neuburgs were a cadet branch of the prestigious Beaumont family. Waleran's and William's uncle, Archbishop Rotrou of Rouen, a commanding figure in Henry's court, had died just the previous year. For whatever reason, Waleran's relief was put at a modest 500m. or £333,<sup>56</sup> far below £5 on the knight's fee. The agreement stipulated that certain lands and revenues be set aside in Warwickshire and Gloucestershire to pay off the debt. As per agreement £20 were paid in at the exchequer to cover the first half-year term,<sup>57</sup> a full £40 were paid in the second year,<sup>58</sup> but in the third year nothing was paid. In the following year, 1188, the £273 remainder of the debt was unceremoniously cancelled.<sup>59</sup> The non-assessment and non-collection of reliefs demonstrates just how far Henry II's patronage of the earls could go.

There is at first glance a darker side to Henry's treatment of the descent of earldoms. On several occasions he interfered directly in the natural descent of the kingdom's wealthiest earldoms, but on each occasion family interests were at stake. Although Henry continued his predecessors' practice of awarding honors and knights' fees to loyal barons and aspiring administrators, his permanent grants were on a much lesser scale. Henry felt, as Ralph of Diceto explains, that barons ought to be content for the most part with their own patrimonies.<sup>60</sup> The king could not afford to be granting away large tracts of land, while at the same time attempting to restore the royal demesne and the monarchy's revenues. Thus, from the beginning of the reign he husbanded lands coming back to the crown. By 1166, eleven large baronies were being kept in royal custody.<sup>61</sup> By 1184, their number

<sup>55</sup>The other inheritances for which a relief could have been demanded are: Hereford (1156), Essex (1166), Salisbury (1168), Leicester (1168), Hertford (1173), Sussex-Old Buckenham (1176), Norfolk (1177), and Devon (1188).

<sup>56</sup>*Pipe Roll 31 Henry II* (Pipe Roll Society, 34, 1913), p. 149.

<sup>57</sup>*Pipe Roll 31 Henry II*, p. 149.

<sup>58</sup>*Pipe Roll 32 Henry II* (Pipe Roll Society, 36, 1914), p. 121.

<sup>59</sup>*Pipe Roll 34 Henry II* (Pipe Roll Society, 38, 1925), p. 108.

<sup>60</sup>Ralph of Diceto, *Imagines Historiarum*, 1:371.

<sup>61</sup>These are: Berkhamstead, Boulogne, Buckingham, Eye, Haughley, Lancaster, Peverel of Nottingham, Peverel of London, Rayleigh, Tickhill, and Wallingford.

had risen to fourteen, counting the earldoms of Gloucester, Cornwall, Sussex, and Buckingham. Through the retention of these baronies, Henry was able at once to supplement his income, reward *familiaris* with lucrative estates,<sup>62</sup> and exercise an immediate influence over a sizable portion of the kingdom's knight service. But, it was not Henry's purpose to keep these baronies permanently in hand. Most were to be assigned, when the proper time came, to members of the royal family. In this, Henry acted no differently from his predecessors, or for that matter his successors.

The needs of the royal family were considerable. Eleanor of Aquitaine bore her husband eight children, five boys and three girls, in the short period between 1153 and 1166.<sup>63</sup> Each had to be provided for and Henry concerned himself with his children's future almost from the moment of their births. After the death of his first born son, William, in 1156, Henry had his second son and namesake designated heir to the English and Norman states, and perhaps his successor in Anjou. Richard was then named heir presumptive to his mother's duchy of Aquitaine, while a third son, Geoffrey was placed with the help of armed force in line to inherit the duchy of Brittany and its associated English earldom of Richmond. John, the fourth son, for the time being was left without lands. Meanwhile, Henry the Younger was betrothed in 1158 to King Louis VII's daughter, Margaret. Although the extreme youth of the English prince and the French princess prevented Henry II from looking too far into the future, Louis VII was at this time without a male heir. Henry II might have imagined the day when his son would sit on the throne of France as well as that of England. In view of the importance of the match, Henry II promised as Margaret's dower 300 knights' fees in England, 200 knights' fees in Normandy, the cities of Lincoln and Avranches, plus an annuity of £2,000 sterling.<sup>64</sup> Doubtless, the necessary revenues and fees were to come from the baronies the English king was so busily taking into his hands. Henry intended to rely on the same source in providing for his other children. In 1181, Geoffrey, a natural son,

<sup>62</sup>Thus Richard of Hummet, the Norman constable, received fiefs taken from the earldom of Buckingham and Giffard lands in England and Normandy. These same fiefs passed on to his son and successor as constable, William. The value of the English fiefs alone exceeded £94 sterling annually. See, *Pipe Roll 13 Henry II* (Pipe Roll Society, 11, 1889), p. 112; *Pipe Roll 29 Henry II*, p. 86; and *Recueil des actes de Henri II*, 2:nos. 466 and 549.

<sup>63</sup>William (b. 1153-d. 1156), Henry (b. 1155-d. 1183), Richard (b. 1157-d. 1199), Geoffrey (b. 1158-d. 1186), John (b. 1166-d. 1216); and Matilda (b. 1156), Eleanor (b. 1161), and Johanna (b. 1165). Henry II also fathered two natural sons: Geoffrey bishop elect of Lincoln, chancellor of England, later archbishop of York; and William, future earl of Salisbury.

<sup>64</sup>Robert of Torigny, Vatican MS R. printed in *Rerum Gallicarum et Francicarum Scriptores: Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, ed. M. Bouquet et al, 24 vols. (Paris, 1738-1904) 13: 300.

was given the Norman barony of Giffard to sustain him during his tenure as chancellor.<sup>65</sup> The lion's share of the baronies, however, were meant for John, in whose behalf Henry went after the largest of the English earldoms.

The sequence of events which brought John the earldoms began in 1173, shortly after Henry's return from his Irish campaign and a few months before his elder sons' rebellion. Henry sought a marriage contract with the count of Maurienne which would have allowed John to succeed to the lordship of the count's strategically placed transalpine realm. It was an ideal match for Henry's landless son, or so he thought. The count was interested in what type of revenues John might be given to support his daughter before the ultimate inheritance. As part of the negotiations on his part, Henry agreed to give John three castles along the Angevin frontier. John's brothers had a rather different idea. They were not about to sit idly by while their younger brother's fortune was made. True, they had titles and promises of land, but as of yet no independent revenues of their own. It was hard for their father who had spent his youth seeking an inheritance and his adult life restoring its glory, indeed expanding it, to relinquish any part of it.

Henry the Younger, who was due to inherit Anjou, refused to acknowledge John's ownership of the castles. This was the incident that threw the Angevin dominions into chaos, for the prince ran off to his father-in-law in Paris, and with his help began the rebellion. Soon the barons were drawn in and Henry II had to drop the negotiations with the count of Maurienne and fight for his own dominions. By late 1174 when the rebellion had exhausted itself, the marriage offer from Maurienne was withdrawn.<sup>66</sup> The king was still in search of a proper settlement for his youngest, and now favorite, son. Ireland, a recent Angevin acquisition, was one possibility, but the island still had to be won over completely; and Ireland was far removed from the center of Angevin politics. Better prospects could be found closer to home in traditional royal appanages: Cornwall, Gloucester, and Mortain.

Thus, Robert of Toriginy reports that when Earl Reginald of Cornwall died in 1175, the king kept all of his estates in England, Wales, and Normandy for the benefit of his son, John. The earl's daughters and grandson were allowed revenues from a small portion of the estate as their inheritance.<sup>66</sup> After all, Baldwin of Redvers would receive his paternal earldom of Devon when he came of age; the earl's daughters were countesses of Hertford and Meulan; John had nothing. The earldom of Cornwall had been created in the first place by William the Conqueror for his half-brother Robert count of Mortain; it was later confiscated by King

<sup>65</sup>The Maurienne marriage proposal is discussed at length by Thomas Jones, *War of the Generations*, pp. 87ff.

<sup>66</sup>Robert Toriginy, *Chronicles and Memorials*, 4:268.

Henry I only to be regranted to his natural son Reginald by his half-sister Empress Maud, Henry II's mother. Now Henry II was setting it aside for John.

Cornwall, it seems, was not enough. Henry convinced his cousin, William earl of Gloucester, in 1176 to designate the youngest of the earl's three daughters as heir to Gloucester, and then promptly betrothed John to the heiress.<sup>67</sup> In both instances legal convention was violated by disallowing daughters to share equally in the division of their father's estates when there was no immediate male heir. Maybe Henry considered it unreasonable to split up these powerful earldoms among many heirs. Or, perhaps he thought it unpolitic to measurably increase the power of the earl of Devon, earl of Hertford, count of Meulan, count of Evreux, and vicomte of Limoges who stood to gain these estates through their mothers and wives. Why diminish the strength of the monarchy and royal family, especially just after it had been tested in the recent rebellion? In the end, John would be granted by King Richard I, as their father had intended, the above earldoms and lands from royal custody with over 900 knights' fees, prompting William of Newburgh to remark that overnight "Lackland" had become a "tetrarch."<sup>68</sup> In Henry's mind family came first; and family lands were to remain in the family.

Similar reasoning helps explain why the king withheld the honor of Arundel from William III of Aubigny, heir to the earldom of Sussex, son of William II of Aubigny and Adeliza, widow of King Henry I. When Earl William II died in 1176, his son immediately came into possession of the Aubigny barony of Old Buckenham (co. Norfolk). But the honor of Arundel, Adeliza's marriage gift from Henry I, was taken back into royal custody, where the pipe rolls show it remained until released to the Aubigny's in 1190 by King Richard I.<sup>69</sup> Whatever Henry's reasons, William III's relationship with his king, like that of Robert III earl of Leicester, was not of the same quality as his father's. This raises the important question: was Henry II in the latter part of his reign turning away from the earls?

Death removed the earls from Henry's inner-circle as the reign pro-

<sup>67</sup>*Gesta Henrici Secundi*, 1:124-125. The terms of the agreement are fully discussed in *Earldom of Gloucester Charters*, ed. R.B. Patterson (Oxford, 1973), p. 5. Henry I had made a similar arrangement when he married his son Robert to Mabel, daughter of Robert fitz Hamon, and made her the heiress to the disadvantage of her sisters: *Monasticon*, 2:60-61. I owe this point to the kind advice of C. Warren Hollister.

<sup>68</sup>William of Newburgh, *Historia Anglorum in Chronicles and Memorials*, 1:301-302.

<sup>69</sup>*Pipe Roll 29 Henry II*, p. xxvii; *Pipe Roll 33 Henry II*, p. 109; *The Great Roll of the Pipe for the First Year of the Reign of Richard the First, A.D. 1189-1190 (sic)*, ed. Joseph Hunter (Record Commission, 1844), pp. 12-13; and *Pipe Roll 2 Richard I* (Pipe Roll Society, NS, 1, 1925), pp. 127, 129, 130.

gressed. This was a natural consequence of a lengthy reign. Indeed, seventeen of the eighteen earls who had begun the reign in 1155 were dead by 1184. The rise of ministerial families such as the Bardouls, Fitz Bernards, Fitz Stephens, Glanvilles, and others are due to the mortality rate of the earls and barons who were close to the king. Members of the royal household stepped in to fill the void left by the deaths of the barons not only because of their administrative and military skills, but also because of their long term familiarity with the king. If sons of barons and earls failed to rise to the positions of their fathers at Henry's court, it was only because their destiny lay at the courts of the king's own sons. In many respects Henry was a prisoner of his generation, a generation that had come of age in the turbulent times of the 1140s and 1150s. It is from this generation that he sought companionship and the talent to rule his dominions. He had the same problem with the children of his comrades that he had with his own children; he never took them seriously. That Henry continued to rely on the earls in the late 1170s and 1180s is shown by his relationship with William II of Mandeville, third earl of Essex.

William of Mandeville inherited the earldom of Essex in 1166,<sup>70</sup> after the death of his brother,<sup>71</sup> Geoffrey III. Little is known of William's early years and training. The Walden chronicler tells us that he spent most of his youth at the court of the counts of Flanders, receiving the belt of knighthood from the hands of Count Philip, Henry II's first cousin.<sup>72</sup> Philip's warm recommendation of William was partly responsible for Henry's speedy transfer of the earldom to him.<sup>73</sup> The Mandeville lands, from which the earldom had been created in 1141, formed one of the wealthiest honors in England at the time of Domesday Book,<sup>74</sup> and by 1166 contained 110 knights' fees. The family's hereditary custodianship of the Tower of London and two valuable

<sup>70</sup>*Pipe Roll 13 Henry II*, p. 152.

<sup>71</sup>*The Foundation Book of Walden Abbey*, p. 142 col. 2 refers to Geoffrey III as the eldest son of Geoffrey II of Mandeville, the first earl of Essex and the founder of the abbey. John Horace Round in his *Geoffrey de Mandeville* (London, 1892), pp. 228-231 and *passim* supposed that Ernulf of Mandeville was the eldest son and natural heir to Essex but had been disinherited as the result of outrages committed against the Church during the civil war by both him and his father. I am inclined to follow Sidney Painter, *Feudalism and Liberty: Articles and Addresses of Sidney Painter*, ed. Fred A. Cazel, Jr. (Baltimore, 1961), pp. 216-217 n. 37, in his argument that Ernulf was a bastard of Geoffrey II and therefore not the rightful heir to the earldom.

<sup>72</sup>*The Foundation Book of Walden Abbey*, p. 143, col. 2.

<sup>73</sup>*The Foundation Book of Walden Abbey*, p. 143, col. 2.

<sup>74</sup>*Domesday Book*, 1:fos. 36, 62, 129b, 132, 139, 159b, 227; 2: fos. 57b, 100, 106b, 411. In 1086, the value of the Mandeville lands exceeded £740. This places the family among the top ten wealthiest lay landholders in England. See, Hollister, "Magnates and *Curiales* in Early Norman England," Table A.

manors, however, were withheld from William.<sup>75</sup> If William harbored any grievances over this reduction of his inheritance, they never came to the surface; and he was more than compensated for their loss by his friendship with the king.

Earl William began to frequent Henry II's entourage shortly after his investiture. His rise at court during the 1170s was due as much to his own considerable military and diplomatic skills as to the deaths of the king's baronial advisors from the early years. Throughout the 1170s and 1180s he was at Henry's side, or elsewhere engaged in royal business.<sup>76</sup> It is possible to trace his movements back and forth from England and the continent in the pipe rolls.<sup>77</sup> Between 1173 and 1187 no less than nineteen Channel crossings are recorded, some of which were related to the embassies led by William to the courts of Flanders, France, and Germany.<sup>78</sup> Earl William gained the respect of Henry II and the younger generation as well. When King Philip of France, in 1188, suggested that he and Henry II should settle their differences through a trial by combat, William Marshall volunteered that the English champions should be himself and Earl William of Mandeville.<sup>79</sup> King Richard I would later show his confidence in the earl by

<sup>75</sup>For the Mandeville claim to the custodianship of the Tower of London, see C. Warren Hollister, "The Misfortunes of the Mandeville's," *History* 58 (1973):18-28 and the authorities cited therein. The author of *The Foundation Book of Walden Abbey* mentions the reservation of the Tower of London but goes on to say that Earl William received the rest of his estates unimpaired. This was not the case. In an earlier passage the author recounts Henry II's anger with Geoffrey III because of his refusal to co-habit with the wife the king had chosen for him, who just happened to be one of Henry's cousins. The woman in question is unnamed. Following a divorce, she was remarried promptly to Ansel of Camdeaveine count of St. Pol (d. 1174). For her marriage portion, Henry II took the liberty of confiscating £100 worth of land, 3 knights' fees, and the manors of Waltham and Walden from the earldom of Essex. This was done, no doubt, as retribution for the insult to the royal family's honor. In time, Geoffrey III and Henry II were reconciled, as the earl's later career suggests. For further details, see *The Foundation Book of Walden Abbey*, pp. 142-143; *Complete Peerage*, 5:117ff; *The Red Book of the Exchequer*, 1:345; and *Pipe Roll 30 Henry II* (Pipe Roll Society, 33, 1912), p. 144.

<sup>76</sup>William of Mandeville is among the top five attestors of Henry II's charters, see above note 17.

<sup>77</sup>*Pipe Roll 20 Henry II* (Pipe Roll Society, 21, 1896), p. 135; *Pipe Roll 22 Henry II*, p. 211; *Pipe Roll 23 Henry II*, p. 207; *Pipe Roll 25 Henry II*, p. 120; *Pipe Roll 26 Henry II* (Pipe Roll 29, 1908) p. 148; *Pipe Roll 27 Henry II* (Pipe Roll Society, 30, 1909), p. 152; *Pipe Roll 28 Henry II*, p. 150; *Pipe Roll 29 Henry II*, p. 160; *Pipe Roll 31 Henry II*, p. 233; *Pipe Roll 33 Henry II*, p. 210.

<sup>78</sup>*Pipe Roll 23 Henry II*, p. 207; *Gesta Henrici Secundi*, 1:287; Eyton, *Court, Household and Itinerary*, p. 274.

<sup>79</sup>*Histoire de Guillaume le Maréchal*, 1:271-275. *The Gesta Henrici Secundi*, 2:45-46 mentions William Marshal as one of the envoys sent by Henry II to Philip of France in 1188 to warn the French monarch that any further aggression on his part would result in Henry's renunciation of his fealty for the Angevin French dominions. This report goes far to support the story related by the Marshal's biographer almost forty years later.

naming him co-justiciar and regent of England before going off on the Third Crusade.<sup>80</sup>

There were many rewards for royal service. As might be expected of someone with Earl William's social status and proximity to the king, he rarely paid monies into the English exchequer; instead, monies were paid out to him. Over a twenty-two year period, the miniscule sum of £174 was levied against William in the form of scutages, aids, forest pleas, murder fines, and communal taxes. Of this amount, £3 were all that was ever paid into the exchequer, the remaining sum being pardoned.<sup>81</sup> In contrast, William took more than £1600 from the exchequer in *terrae datae*, outright gifts, and the third penny for Essex.<sup>82</sup> Again, the idea of the burdensome nature of the early Angevin monarchy requires serious modification, at least as far as the earls are concerned. An even more valuable reward came to William through his marriage in 1180, arranged by Henry, to Hawise, heiress to the Anglo-Norman lands and fees of the counts of Aumale.<sup>83</sup> Richard of Devizes characterizes the countess of Aumale as "a woman who was almost a man, lacking nothing virile except virile organs."<sup>84</sup> Whatever the facts of the matter, the countess was a rich prize, bringing William the baronies of Holderness and Skipton in England and the county and castle of Aumale in Normandy.<sup>85</sup>

<sup>80</sup>*Gesta Henrici Secundi*, 1:87 and Lionel Landon, *The Itinerary King Richard I* (Pipe Roll Society, NS, 13, 1935), pp. 11-23.

<sup>81</sup>*Pipe Roll 13 Henry II*, pp. 106, 164; *Pipe Roll 14 Henry II*, pp. 39, 44, 202; *Pipe Roll 15 Henry II*, pp. 126, 128; *Pipe Roll 16 Henry II*, p. 72; *Pipe Roll 17 Henry II*, p. 72; *Pipe Roll 18 Henry II*, pp. 124, 133; *Pipe Roll 19 Henry II*, p. 43; *Pipe Roll 21 Henry II*, pp. 135, 136; *Pipe Roll 22 Henry II*, pp. 29, 71, 72; *Pipe Roll 23 Henry II*, pp. 47, 48, 149, 150; *Pipe Roll 24 Henry II*, (Pipe Roll Society, 27, 1906), pp. 37, 104; *Pipe Roll 25 Henry II*, pp. 33, 55, 86; *Pipe Roll 26 Henry II*, p. 39; *Pipe Roll 29 Henry II*, p. 138; *Pipe Roll 30 Henry II*, pp. 46, 47, 117, 118, 132, 140; *Pipe Roll 31 Henry II*, pp. 16, 19, 57, 65, 137; *Pipe Roll 34 Henry II*, pp. 89, 92, 84. These assessments represent those levied against William's private holdings, as is the case where figures are cited for other earls elsewhere in this paper, and do not account for such items as the farm of the English lands of the count of Flanders which were placed in William's custody from time to time by Henry II: see following note and note 89.

<sup>82</sup>The third penny for Essex alone brought in £40 10s., 10d. annually: *Pipe Roll 13 Henry II*, p. 152. For other monies paid to William, see *Pipe Roll 20 Henry II*, pp. 49, 73, 75, 87; *Pipe Roll 21 Henry II*, pp. 2, 3, 19, 43, 78, 144, 146, 150, 151, 156, 157; *Pipe Roll 22 Henry II*, pp. 5, 10, 121; *Pipe Roll 23 Henry II*, pp. 117, 154; *Pipe Roll 24 Henry II*, p. 47; *Pipe Roll 25 Henry II*, pp. 52 and 128. Again, this sum does not include whatever profits Earl William might have taken from the custodianship of the lands of the count of Flanders.

<sup>83</sup>Ralph of Diceto, *Imagines Historiarum*, 2:3.

<sup>84</sup>*The Chronicle of Richard of Devizes*, ed. John T. Appleby (NMT, 1963), p. 10.

<sup>85</sup>See Sanders, *English Baronies*, p. 142; *The Red Book of the Exchequer*, 1:430-432, 434; *Early Yorkshire Charters*, 7:90-96; *Pipe Roll 14 Henry II*, p. 90; *Pipe Roll 18 Henry II*, p. 62; and *The Chancellor's Roll 8 Richard I* (Pipe Roll Society, NS, 7, 1930), p. 185. See also for Holderness, Barbara English, *The Lords of Holderness 1086-1260* (Oxford, 1980).

Henry seems to have had more in mind in arranging William of Mandeville's marriage to the Aumale heiress than merely augmenting his companion's already impressive estates. William's possession of the county of Aumale established him as one of the great border barons along the sensitive eastern Norman frontier, and Henry meant to rely on the earl as the defender of that frontier. This design is revealed to us in two contemporary sources. The Walden chronicler, after discussing the earl's marriage, goes on to say that he "was a brave man, mighty in arms and held in esteem by all; and therefore he abode little in England among his own people, but guarded the castles and fortifications in Normandy handed over to him by King Henry, which were stronger than the rest and situated along the frontier."<sup>86</sup> A fragment from the 1184 Norman pipe roll discloses that the castles in question were Gisors, Neaufle, Dangu, Neufchateau, and Vaudreuil in the strategic Vexin and southwest of the Seine.<sup>87</sup> Henry's trust was never betrayed. William of Mandeville continued to be a valued and

<sup>86</sup>*Foundation Book of Walden Abbey*, p. 144, col. 1.

<sup>87</sup>*Magni Rotuli Scaccarii Normanniae Sub Regibus Anglie*, ed. Thomas Stapleton, 2 vols. (London, 1840-1844), 1:111, 112, 116, 118, 120, 121: "Comes Willelmus pro Gisoricio et Valle Rodolii, . . . In lib ipsi Com dccc. li . . . de .m. li. qas ht p ann p custod cast<sup>o</sup>ru de Gisorc et Neelfa, et Dangu, et Novo Cast<sup>o</sup> sup Etta, et Valle Rodol." Stapleton was convinced that the "Comes Willelmus" of these entries was William III of Aubigny, the second earl of Sussex, and this identification was followed by later authorities such as Sir Maurice Powicke, *The Loss of Normandy*, 2nd ed. (New York, 1961), p. 69 and Leopold Delisle, *Recueil des actes de Henri II*, Intro, p. 472. However, all the evidence points to William II of Mandeville earl of Essex and count of Aumale's custodianship of the castles. Gervase of Canterbury specifically mentions William II of Mandeville as the defender of Gisors in 1187. The *Gesta Henrici Secundi* tells us that the constable of Gisors in 1186 was Henry of Ver, "Consanguineus Willelmi de Mandevil Comitiss Aubemarl." This same Henry of Ver is named in the *Foundation Book of Walden Abbey* as the earl's cousin and a member of his household. He is found attesting the earl's English charters and was related through Rohese of Ver. William's mother. All of this suggests very strongly that the "Comes Willelmus" of the 1184 Norman roll was none other than our William II of Mandeville. See, *Gesta Henrici Secundi*, 1: 354-355; Gervase of Canterbury, *Historical Works*, 1:347; *The Foundation Book of Walden Abbey*, p. 145, col. 1ff. Professor J.C. Holt informs me that several of William II of Mandeville's private charters support this conclusion. Further evidence comes from the Norman roll itself. A William son of Ade is pardoned £100 in one entry for the remainder of the tallage of Drincourt due from "Comes Willelmus." The sons of Ade of Waltham, who took their name from the Mandeville manor, appear frequently in the English Pipe Rolls under the county of Essex. Another of the entries shows Geoffrey of Say, the son of William's aunt Beatrice of Say, in debt for some victuals he had gotten from the munition of Gisors. And finally, the sum of 20m. is noted as having been paid out to "Comes Willelmus" in reimbursement for the money he had lent for the liveries of the knights of the garrison of Arras. This last entry certainly pertains to our William of Mandeville, who had gone to the aid of the count of Flanders in 1184 when Philip of France threatened to invade the count's territories: see *Magni Rotuli Scaccarii Normanniae*, 1:111, 117; *Pipe Roll 22 Henry II*, p. 5; *Pipe Roll 21 Henry II*, p. 72; and Ralph of Diceto, *Images Historiarum*, 2:32.

useful ally, especially where the aging king's relations with his troublesome cousin Count Philip of Flanders were concerned.

From 1180 until his death in 1189, Henry was involved in the tasks of maintaining the integrity of his vast dominions, finding a workable solution to the succession problem brought about by the premature deaths of his elder sons, and preventing an ongoing dispute between Philip of Flanders and Philip of France from erupting into a large-scale war which might have endangered the tenuous balance of power on the continent. In this last endeavor he sought to utilize Earl William's long-standing friendship with Philip of Flanders to help end the Franco-Flemish conflict. This is the reason, no doubt, that Henry chose the city of Aumale on at least two occasions for the site of peace talks arranged between the warring parties,<sup>88</sup> and it also explains why William was named receiver for Count Philip's English revenues while the count was in disfavor.<sup>89</sup> Henry's efforts to end the hostilities were all too successful: once the two Philips were reconciled, they turned their energies towards humbling the English king, who was to find no respite in his final years, not even from his sons Richard and John.

But William of Mandeville remained loyal to Henry II up to the last. His final meeting with the king he had served so faithfully came a month before Henry's death in July 1189. At this meeting the earl was made to swear that if ill befell Henry, he would hand over the castles in his charge to no one except Prince John.<sup>90</sup> Clearly, Henry was toying with the idea of replacing Richard with John as his heir, but John's disloyalty to his father in these final months released the earl from his oath. As it happened, Richard inherited the Angevin territories intact and like his father sought to utilize Earl William's talents in their governance and defense. He appointed William co-justiciar and regent of England and sent him on an embassy to

<sup>88</sup>Ralph of Diceto, *Imagines Historiarum*, 2:35ff. *Gesta Henrici Secundi*, 2:4-5; Eyton, *Court, Household and Itinerary*, p. 266. Earl William and Count Philip had remained close friends after the earl entered Henry II's service, even though they often found themselves on opposing sides in the constant warfare of the times. These two boyhood companions went crusading together in 1177-1178, spending the entire year in each others company: *Gesta Henrici Secundi*, 1:159 and Ralph of Diceto *Imagines Historiarum*, 1:423.

<sup>89</sup>*Pipe Roll 27 Henry II*, pp. 10, 51, 64, 110; *Pipe Roll 28 Henry II*, pp. 60-61, 14, 50, 123, 150; *Pipe Roll 29 Henry II*, pp. 7, 62, 71, 86, 100; *Pipe Roll 30 Henry II*, pp. 14, 69, 95; *Pipe Roll 31 Henry II*, pp. 81, 105, 110; *Pipe Roll 32 Henry II*, pp. 111, 70, 102; *Pipe Roll 33 Henry II*, pp. 67-68. John Horace Round, *Peerage and Family History* (London, 1901), pp. 171-177 discusses the English lands of the counts of Flanders.

<sup>90</sup>"Senescalco Normanniae, Guillelme Radulphi filio, et Comite Guillelmo de Mandevilla ante constrictus, de munitionibus Normanniae cunctis, siquid de ipso sinistrum forte contigerit, filio suo juniore Johanni reddendis": Gerald of Wales, *Opera*, eds. J.S. Brewer et al, 8 vols. (Rolls Series, 1861-1891), 4:369. On Henry II's intentions for John, see my "Geoffrey Plantagenet's Will and the Angevin Succession," *Albion* 6 (1974):271.

the court of Philip of France. The earl was never to return to England. Departing from Paris, he fell ill at Gisors and died five months after the passing of his patron and friend, King Henry II.<sup>91</sup>

Henry II came to the throne of England in 1154 at the youthful age of twenty-one, already duke of Normandy, count of Anjou and by marriage duke of Aquitaine.<sup>92</sup> England shone as the brightest star in this constellation of Angevin dominions. In England Henry was king,<sup>93</sup> the successor to a line of monarchs which had begun with William the Conqueror. Henry's youth had been spent fighting for this rightful inheritance against the usurper Stephen of Blois, and the restoration of that inheritance after nearly two decades of civil war became the guiding force of his reign. Henry's measure of success in raising the monarchy to his vision of its former position is reflected in his boast, made in 1168, "that at last he had regained the privileges of his grandfather, Henry I, who was king, apostolic legate, patriarch, emperor, and all that he wished in his land."<sup>94</sup>

Exaggeration aside, Henry indeed had recreated a strong monarchy by the late 1160s, a monarchy capable of withstanding the consecutive shocks of the Becket affair and the rebellion of the king's sons. Significantly, the restoration of the monarchy was carried through with the close cooperation of the kingdom's great barons—the earls. They were partners in Henry II's aggressive administration, not, by and large, its adversaries. Early on, Reginald earl of Cornwall and Robert II earl of Leicester exercised wide powers over the kingdom's governance, and in doing so brought the well-connected Angevin and Beaumont families into the government. Later, when the generation of the administrative earls had died, Henry turned to depend on the able William II of Mandeville earl of Essex and count of Aumale. Far from being anti-baronial, or simply disinterested in the feudal baronage, Henry consciously sought to bind the earls to the monarchy by ties of policy, kinship, and friendship as had his predecessors.

It is wrong to suggest, then, that Henry II's fiscal policies were aimed at extorting large sums of money from a baronage increasingly overshadowed by a professional administrative class, nor does the pipe roll evidence support such a conclusion. The earls, as the rolls show, hardly ever account-

<sup>91</sup>*The Chronicle of Richard of Devizes*, p. 10; *The Foundation Book of Walden Abbey*, p. 144 col. 1.

<sup>92</sup>The circumstances under which Henry came into possession of his continental dominions are discussed in Hollister and Keefe, "The Making of the Angevin Empire," pp. 19-22.

<sup>93</sup>Richard of Poitiers, after recounting Henry's several continental lordships, remarks, "but in consideration of the honor and reverence of the royal name he is called king of the English," *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, 12:417. Thus, royal status gave Henry a place high above that of a mere, if immensely wealthy, continental prince.

<sup>94</sup>John of Salisbury, *Opera Omnia*, ed. J.A. Giles, 5 vols. (Oxford, 1848), 2:114.

ed to the exchequer, or if they did, rarely paid much of the sums charged against them.<sup>55</sup> Those who seek to find extortionate tendencies and baronial discontent in the reign of Henry II would do well to keep this in mind. They might also pause to reflect on a clause in the barons' 1217 reissue of Magna Carta in the name of the minor king, Henry III. It reads,

scutage shall henceforth be taken as it was customarily taken in the time of King Henry II our grandfather.<sup>56</sup>

If the contest between the baronage and the Angevin monarchy over administrative abuses and taxation is to remain a dominant theme in English medieval history, the origin of the contest is not to be found in the reign of the first Angevin monarch.

<sup>55</sup>It is well-known that the pipe rolls do not cover all royal receipts and expenditures, that from time to time monies were paid directly to the king or into his chamber, see H.G. Richardson, "Richard Fitz Neal and the *Dialogus de Scaccario*," *English Historical Review* 43 (1928):161-171, 321-340, and "The Chamber Under Henry II," *ibid.*, 69 (1954):596-611; and J.E.A. Jolliffe, "The *Camera Regis* Under Henry II," *ibid.*, 68 (1953):1-21, 337-362. Thus, some royal-baronial transactions not recorded by the pipe rolls are mentioned by other sources. For example, a thirteenth century court record states that Henry of Lacy promised Henry II 1000m. to resolve a succession dispute over the honor of Pontefract: *Curia Regis Rolls*, 13:66-67. A promise, however, is not evidence of payment. On the other hand, the sum of 2000m. is said to have been paid the king by Hugh bisop of Durham, "so that his castles might stand and that he might again know the king's love": *Gesta Henrici Secundi*, 1:160. Such a transaction, in light of the bishop's suspected sympathies with the 1173 rebels, is not unreasonable, but again the full details elude us. The same chronicle reports a payment of 1000m. on October 9, 1176 by Gilbert son of Fergus of Galloway to regain the king's love after Gilbert's involvement in the murder of his brother: *Gesta Henrici Secundi*, 1:126. Yet, turning in this case to the 1178-1179 pipe roll, we find Gilbert debited with £1000, not 1000m.: *Pipe Roll 25 Henry II*, p. 31. Were there two separate assessments, or did the *Gesta* simply confuse pounds with marks, indicating a single, unpaid assessment? There is no way to tell. Similarly, Ralph of Diceto has Hugh Bigod earl of Norfolk paying 1000m. to regain the king's good will following the 1173 rebellion: *Images Historiarum*, 1:384-385, a figure in excess of the £466 recorded by the pipe roll: see note 52 above. Caution, then, must be used in approaching transactions between the king and barons reported by sources other than the pipe rolls where they can be traced.

The above especially applies to the some £5000 worth of baronial debts due the royal financier William Cade allegedly collected by Henry II after Cade's death in 1165: see Hilary Jenkinson, "William Cade, A Financier of the Twelfth Century" *English Historical Review* 28 (1913):522-527, and by the same author, "A Money-Lender's Bonds of the Twelfth Century," in *Essays Presented to Reginald Lane Poole*, ed. by H.W.C. Davis (Oxford, 1927), pp. 190-120; see also John Horace Round, "The Debtors of William Cade," *English Historical Review* 28(1913):522-527. The list of debtors is made up largely of court officials and those with access to Henry II's court. It would seem that these individuals borrowed from Cade or sought mortgages from him just like Henry II himself. There are many possible explanations for such heavy borrowing running from the high cost of sustaining oneself in royal service to the need for ready money to pursue some profitable investment. Whatever the explanation, it is doubtful that Henry would have collected such debts from the officials, earls, or others in his service. In the final analysis, the pipe rolls offer the surest, certainly the most comprehensive, evidence of royal-baronial financial dealings.

<sup>56</sup>*Select Charters and Other Illustrations of English Constitutional History*, ed. William Stubbs, 9th edition revised by H.W.C. Davis (Oxford, 1913), cl. 44, p. 343.

Table 1  
Exchequer Record of English Earls, 1155-1189.

Earls	Knights' Accounting Period			Paid £	Pardoned £	Percent Paid/Levied
	Fees	Fr	To Yrs			
William of Blois earl of Surrey	432	'55	'59 4	450	0	450 0%
William earl of Gloucester	322	'55	'83 28	557	294	263 53%
Reginald earl of Cornwall	215	'55	'75 20	403	1	41 0%
Hugh earl of Chester	198	'55	'81 26	24	16	8 67%
Rannulph earl of Chester	198	'81	'89 8	131	126	5 96%
Conan of Brittany earl of Richmond	188	'55	'71 16	299	108	191 36%
Prince Geoffrey earl of Richmond	188	'71	'86 15	177	177	0 100%
William II of Aubigny earl of Sussex	163	'55	'76 21	114	2	112 2%
Hugh Bigod earl of Norfolk	161	'55	'77 22	1816	1132	343 62%
Robert III of Beaumont earl of Leicester	157	'68	'89 21	770	505	3 66%
Robert II of Beaumont earl of Leicester	157	'55	'68 13	216	0	198 0%

	Knights' Accounting Period				Levied £	Paid £	Pardoned £	Paid £
	Fees	Fr	To	Yrs				
Roger Bigod earl of Norfolk	151	'77	'89	12	334	1	333	0%
Roger of Clare earl of Hertford	150	'55	'73	18	225	24	156	9%
Richard of Clare earl of Hertford	141	'73	'89	16	76	10	0	13%
Hameline of Anjou earl of Surrey	140	'64	'89	25	239	52	187	22%
Baldwin of Redvers earl of Devon	131	'62	'88	26	225	205	20	91%
Richard of Redvers earl of Devon	131	'55	'62	7	3	0	3	0%
William earl of Warwick	131	'55	'84	29	343	238	105	69%
Waleran earl of Warwick	131	'84	'89	5	333	60	273	18%
William of Mandeville earl of Essex	110	'66	'89	23	174	3	171	2%
Geoffrey of Mandeville earl of Essex	110	'55	'66	11	24	23	1	96%

Walter Giffard earl of Buckingham	96	'55	'64	9	22	1	21	5%
Richard Fitz Gilbert earl of Pembroke	83	'55	'76	21	76	0	76	0%
Simon of St. Liz earl of Northampton	83	'56	'84	28	136	91	39	67%
William of Ferrers earl of Derby	79	'58	'89	31	393	289	104	74%
Robert of Ferrers earl of Derby	79	'55	'58	3	7	0	7	0%
William III of Aubigny earl of Sussex	65	'76	'89	13	2	1	0	50%
William earl of Salisbury	59	'68	'89	21	62	47	15	76%
Patrick earl of Salisbury	59	'55	'68	13	103	3	100	3%
Earls of Huntingdon	45	'55	'89	34	170	90	80	53%
Aubrey III of Ver earl of Oxford	30	'55	'89	34	58	40	18	69%
Totals	[2692]	..	..	..	7993	3540	3330	

Table 2  
Scutages Levied Against English Earls, 1155-1189

Earls	Knights' Fees	Accounting Period		No. of Scutages Levied	Amount of Scutage Levied £	Payment	
		Fr	To Yrs			Per Year Per Knts'	Per Knts' Fee d.
A. INHERIT POST 1172							
Richard III of Clare earl of Hertford	141	'73	'89 16	0	0	0.00	
William III d'Aubigny earl of Sussex	65	'76	'89 13	0	0	0.00	
Roger Bigod earl of Norfolk	151	'77	'89 12	0	0	0.00	
Waleran earl of Warwick	131	'84	'89 5	0	0	0.00	
B. MINORS							
William of Blois earl of Surrey	432	'55	'59 4	0	0	0.00	
Hugh earl of Chester	198	'55	'81 26	1	13	0.23	
William earl of Warwick	131	'55	'84 29	3	243	10.42	
William of Ferrers earl of Derby	79	'58	'89 31	3	259	15.18	
Baldwin of Redvers earl of Devon	131	'62	'88 26	3	205	14.44	

Prince Geoffrey earl of Richmond	188	'71	'86	15	1	177	15.06
Rannulph earl of Chester	198	'81	'89	8	1	131	19.09
C. ACTIVE SERVICE							
Richard of Redvers earl of Devon	131	'55	'63	7	0	0	0.00
Geoffrey of Mandeville earl of Essex	110	'55	'66	11	1	24	4.76
Robert II of Beaumont earl of Leicester	157	'55	'68	13	0	0	0.00
Patrick earl of Salisbury	59	'55	'68	13	0	0	0.00
Roger of Clare earl of Hertford	150	'55	'73	18	2	206	2.13
Reginald of Dunstanville earl of Cornwall	215	'55	'75	20	2	370	0.00
William II d'Aubigny earl of Sussex	163	'55	'76	21	1	108	0.07
Richard Fitz Gilbert earl of Pembroke	83	'55	'76	21	1	76	0.00
Hameline of Anjou earl of Surrey	140	'64	'89	25	1	60	3.50
William of Mandeville earl of Essex	110	'66	'89	23	1	66	0.00

Earls	Knights' Fees	Accounting Period		No. of Scutages Levied	Amount of Scutage Levied		Payment Per Year Per Knts' Feed.	
		Fr	To Yrs		£		Per Knts'	Feed.
D. LIMITED OR NON-ACTIVE SERVICE								
Robert of Ferrers earl of Derby	79	'55	'58 3	0	0		0.00	
Walter Giffard earl of Buckingham	96	'55	'64 9	0	0		0.00	
Conan of Brittany earl of Richmond	188	'55	'71 16	3	281		8.46	
Hugh Bigod earl of Norfolk	161	'55	'77 22	2	336		22.29	
William earl of Gloucester	322	'55	'83 28	2	412		7.56	
Simon of St. Liz earl of Northampton	83	'56	'84 28	2	116		7.95	
Earls of Huntingdon	45	'55	'89 34	0	0		0.00	
Aubrey III of Ver earl of Oxford	30	'55	'89 34	2	41		8.47	
Robert III of Beaumont earl of Leicester	157	'68	'89 21	2	339		10.33	
William earl of Salisbury	59	'68	'89 21	1	59		8.52	

Table 3  
Scutages Levied Against English Earls, 1155-1189

Earls	Knights' Accounting Period			No. of Scutages Levied	Scutages as Percent of Total	
	Fees	Fr To	Yrs		Ass'ments	Scutages as Percent of Total Payments
A. MINORS						
Hugh earl of Chester	198	'55	'81 26	1	54%	31%
William earl of Warwick	131	'55	'84 29	3	71%	69%
William of Ferrers earl of Derby	79	'58	'89 31	3	66%	54%
Baldwin of Redvers earl of Devon	131	'62	'88 26	3	91%	100%
Prince Geoffrey earl of Richmond	188	'71	'86 15	1	100%	100%
Rannulph earl of Chester	198	'81	'89 8	1	100%	100%
B. ACTIVE SERVICE						
Geoffrey of Mandeville earl of Essex	110	'55	'66 11	1	100%	100%
Roger of Clare earl of Hertford	150	'55	'73 18	2	81%	100%
Reginald of Dunstanville earl of Cornwall	215	'55	'75 20	2	92%	
William II of Aubigny earl of Sussex	163	'55	'76 21	1	95%	50%

Earls	Knights' Accounting Period			No. of Scutages Levied	Scutages as Percent of Total Ass'ments		Scutages as Percent of Total Payments
	Fees	Fr	To Yrs				
Richard Fitz Gilbert earl of Pembroke	83	'55	'76 21	1	99%		
Hameline of Anjou earl of Surrey	140	'64	'89 25	1	25%		98%
William II of Mandeville earl of Essex	110	'66	'89 23	1	38%		
C. LIMITED OR NON- ACTIVE SERVICE							
Conan of Brittany earl of Richmond	188	'55	'71 16	3	94%		98%
Hugh Bigod earl of Norfolk	161	'55	'77 22	2	19%		29%
William earl of Gloucester	322	'55	'83 28	2	74%		97%
Simon of St. Liz earl of Northampton	83	'56	'84 28	2	85%		85%
Aubrey III of Ver earl of Oxford	30	'55	'89 34	2	71%		90%
Robert III of Beaumont earl of Leicester	157	'68	'89 21	2	44%		28%
William earl of Salisbury	59	'68	'89 21	1	95%		94%